



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,874	02/06/2001	Iris Pecker	01/21603	8407

67801 7590 01/27/2009
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.
P.O. BOX 16446
ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

HUTSON, RICHARD G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/776,874	PECKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard G. Hutson	1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 127 and 129 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 127 and 129 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/2008.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment of claim 129, in the paper of 9/29/2008, is acknowledged.

Claims 127 and 129 remain at issue and are pending for examination.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 127 and 129 remain rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,209 B1. An obvious type double patenting rejection is appropriate where conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,209 B1, is drawn to a

recombinantly made mammalian heparanase protein having an amino acid sequence at least 70% homologous to SEQ ID NO: 2. It is noted that SEQ ID NO: 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,209 B1 and SEQ ID NO: 10 of the instant application are 100 % identical. U.S. Patent No. 6,426,209 B1 further discloses the claimed species of SEQ ID NO: 10 with an amino acid substitution of Tyr at position 246 to Phe.

Thus applicants claimed species is obvious over that genus claimed by U.S. Patent No. 6,426,209 B1 based upon the fact that U.S. Patent No. 6,426,209 B1 also teaches the claimed species.

Applicants traverse this rejection on the basis that applicants submit that in order for an obviousness-type double patenting rejection to apply, both the cited reference and the subject invention must be "commonly owned," which means that both must be "wholly or entirely owned by the same person or organization. " See MPEP sec. 804.03 (II) (A). (See also see. 706.02 (I) (2) for a detailed definition of "common ownership.")

Applicants submit that in the present case, the subject invention is co-owned by two entities: (A) InSight Strategy and Marketing Ltd. ("InSight"); and B) Hadasit Medical Research Services and Development Ltd and by contrast, the '209 patent is exclusively owned by InSight.

Applicant's complete argument is acknowledged and has been carefully considered, however, has been found nonpersuasive on the following basis. In order for two or more patents or applications to be given consideration for the issue of double patenting, the two or more patents or applications must have at least one common inventor and/or be either commonly assigned/owned or non-commonly assigned/owned

but subject to a joint research agreement as set forth in 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(2) and (3) pursuant to the CREATE Act (Pub. L. 108-453, 118 Stat. 3596 (2004)). Congress recognized that the amendment to 35 U.S.C. 103(c) would result in situations in which there would be double patenting rejections between applications not owned by the same party (see H.R. Rep. No. 108-425, at 5-6 (2003)). For purposes of a double patenting analysis, the application or patent and the subject matter disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as amended by the CREATE Act will be treated as if commonly owned. See also MPEP § 804.03. Applicants focus and submission that double patenting does not apply to two applications that do not share the same ownership is not found persuasive for the reasons discussed above. The patent and application in question have a common inventor, Iris Pecker, and thus are subject to the provisions of double patenting.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G. Hutson whose telephone number is 571-272-0930. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat T. Nashed can be reached on 571-272-0934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

rgh
1/19/2009

/Richard G Hutson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652